THE HON. SRI A. B. SHETTY : Yes, Sir, that advice will be given.

SRI P. S. NALLA GOUNDER : ஈரோடில் கலப்படமில்லாமல் கலர் போடாமல் இருக்கும் குடியானவர்களுடைய சரக்கை தடுத்து வைக்கப் பட்டிருப்பது உண்மையா ? அப்படியானால் ஏன் ?

THE HON. SRI A. B. SHETTY : That matter will be decided by the food analysts. The results of the analysis are expected to be out in a day or two.

SRI K. T. RAJU : எப்படி இருந்தாலும் கனம் மந்திரி அவர்களும் டி. பி. எச். அவர்களும் செய்யும் காரியங்களுக்கு சர்க்கார் பொறுப்பை ஏற்றுக்கொள்ளும் என்று சொன்னார்கள். சீல் வைக்கப்பட்ட சரக்கை வெளியில் விடவேண்டும் என்று ஒரு உத்தரவு போட்டும் அதிகாரிகள் ஹெல்த் ஆபீசர் உள்பட அதை வெளியில் விடாமல் இருக்கிறார்கள். அப்படி உத்தரவு போட்டும் சரக்கை வெளிவிடாமலிருக்கும் அதிகாரிகள்மீது தக்க நடவடிக்கை எடுப்பார்களா ?

THE HON. SRI A. B. SHETTY : I have no information about the matter.

SRI V. BALAKRISHNAN : As "kunkum" is a popular toilet for ladies, will the Hon. the Minister see that the purity of kunkum is kept intact, by not allowing adulteration of turmeric?

THE HON. SRI A. B. SHETTY : The Government are concerned only with the purity of 'kunkum', but not with those who wear it. (Laughter.)

SRI P. RAMAMURTHI : Sir, will the Government consider addressing the Government of India and advise them to ban this import of middle chrome if it is not used for any particular industrial purpose and if it is used only for the purpose of colouring this commodity?

THE HON. SRI A. B. SHETTY : We shall examine that matter.

MR. SPEAKER : Questions are over.

[*Note.*—An asterisk (*) at the commencement of a speech indicates revision by the Member.]

II.—ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE HON. SPEAKER.

MESSAGE FROM THE COUNCIL.

MR. SPEAKER : I have to announce to the House that I have received the following message, dated 25th September 1956, from the Hon. the Chairman, Madras Legislative Council :—

"In accordance with Rule 130 of the Madras Council Rules, I transmit a copy of the Madras Cultivating Tenants Protection (Amendment) Bill, 1956 (L.A. Bill No. 10 of 1956), as passed and agreed to by the Council on the 25th September 1956 without any amendment and signed by me."

Now, we can proceed with the Madras Cultivating Tenants (Payment of Fair Rent) Bill, 1956.

26th September 1956]

SRI P. RAMAMURTHI: The Hon. the Finance Minister said that he would be making a statement to-day.

III.—STATEMENT *RE* MADRAS-ANDHRA BORDER ISSUE.

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. the Finance Minister said yesterday that he would make a statement. He will now make his statement.

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM: Mr. Speaker, Sir, the Government have considered this issue very carefully and the position and the stand taken by this Government have been fully and clearly stated on the floor of this House. The Government are also very anxious that this border dispute should be settled as early as possible and this border dispute should not be tacked on with the other border disputes arising out of the general re-organization of the States as a result of the States Reorganization Commission's Report. These matters have been made clear to the Government of India and we are expecting a reply from the Government of India at least elucidating the point that this Andhra-Madras border dispute has nothing to do with the other disputes arising out of the general reorganization of the States. Under these circumstances, I do not think it is necessary for any agitation being carried on in this matter, particularly by persons coming from neighbouring States. I find from the papers—and I hope it is correct—that most of the persons participating in the Satyagraha have come from the neighbouring State, i.e., from the disputed area. It is rather unfortunate that they should have been misled and they should have been asked to go over here to carry on this agitation in Madras where such an agitation is absolutely unnecessary and, as I have already said, meaningless. I stick to that word "meaningless", because Satyagraha is after all intended to convert somebody to your own point of view and when we ourselves are of the same point of view, there is no meaning in carrying on Satyagraha. It was also said that the leader of this agitation Mr. Gramaniar proposed to burn a letter of the Prime Minister written to him. He still feels that he is right in taking up that attitude. He has desisted from burning that letter, because some persons have requested him not to do that—not that he has been convinced about it. Such an 10-10 p.m. attitude is rather regrettable. I hope that that attitude will change. After all, the Prime Minister is the Prime Minister of India. He represents the whole of India and any affront to the dignity of his office will be an affront to the dignity of the nation itself. Therefore I hope that such an attitude will not be taken. But that has nothing to do with the problem itself on which there is no difference of opinion. I can understand this agitation going on if there is any difference of opinion with reference to any of the questions arising in this matter. On the other hand, there is identity of opinion. The only question is to move the Government of India to appoint a boundary commission or to ask the Andhra Government to change their attitude with reference to this. Under these circumstances, the satyagraha looks as if it is intended only to embarrass the Madras Government without achieving any purpose whatsoever.